

Editorial and miscellaneous comment continue.

DAILY NEWS
New York, New York
June 17, 1963

1005150687

LIVE FOREVER? HERE'S HOW

We take note again of the alleged scientists, reformers and Dr. Killjoys who keep telling us all we'll live longer by staying away from cigarettes, which these persons believe cause lung cancer and heart disease.

The Dr. Killjoys et al. admit that their evidence is purely statistical. That means they collect coincidences—cases of people who (1) smoked cigarettes and (2) died eventually of lung cancer or heart trouble—and then conclude that the cigarettes caused the fatal diseases.

There is no laboratory evidence that cigarettes ever gave lung cancer or heart disease to a single human being. Also, **Playing With Statistics** the killjoys soft-pedal the statistical fact that most cigarette smokers get neither lung cancer nor heart disease.

But let's play for a moment with this notion that you'll live longer statistically if you don't smoke. Taking off from that notion, you can work out a statistical formula for living, not merely longer, but forever. Here's how you do it:

There are three things that every human being has done or does, from the first human being to today's newest baby.

Those three things are: (1) to breathe air, (2) to drink water, and (3) to eat food of some kind.

And there is one thing that has happened or will happen to every human being ever born in this world. That one thing is death—the departure from this world to, as most of us hope and believe, a better world somewhere.

When you put together the facts stated in the two preceding paragraphs, what do you get—bearing in mind that both facts are statistics concerning human beings?

If you believe firmly in statistics and statistical evidence, and to hell with laboratory proof, you can come to only one logical conclusion.

This conclusion is that the prime and universal causes of human death are the breathing of air, the drinking of water, and the eating of food. You've got to believe that, or betray your beloved statistics.

Hence, statistically, the way to live forever is simply to refrain from eating, drinking water, and breathing. And by failing to ballyhoo this prescription for life eternal on earth, the statistical enemies of the cigarette are shirking their duty to humanity.

Ridiculous? Sure. But let's see anybody pick a logical flaw in this argument. Until somebody does, let's go on giving the horse-laugh to the enemies of the cigarette.

THE LENOIR COUNTY NEWS
Kingston, North Carolina
June 13, 1963

The Attack On Tobacco

The noise grows among so-called men of science and professional nuts who attack smoking as a positive cause of lung cancer. As a non-cigarette smoker we feel it is high time that someone said a word or two in defense of the nicotine habit.

Firstly, we are not an expert, so we do not know if smoking cigarette causes lung cancer, but we cannot avoid wondering why smoking will cause lung cancer (if it does) in one person and not in another.

This is a rare exhibition of statistical nonsense that is being used against tobacco. Post mortems indicate that a high percentage of lung cancer victims are heavy smokers, but other post mortems reveal that many non-smokers also die of lung cancer, and most peculiarly that a lot of heavy smokers do not have lung cancer.

How any so-called man of science can take these three sets of figures and come up with a "positive" case against smoking cigarettes is just one more of the many mysteries of science that confront us today.

The typhoid germ will cause typhoid in people than nicotine, alcohol and gasoline.

everybody. A given per cent of alcohol in the bloodstream will make any of us drunk. A specified dose of cyanide will kill any person. These are positives, but a chemical that does cause cancer (if it does) in one man and not cause cancer in another, does not belong in such positive company.

We wonder, which comes first, the chicken or the egg? Do lung cancer victims smoke or does smoking cause lung cancer? Do painters drink or do drinkers paint?

Why is lung cancer more prevalent in urban than in rural areas; smoking habits to the contrary notwithstanding?

Why do more men have lung cancer than women; smoking habits again aside?

Tobacco has been a whipping boy of the faddists since it became a rather ridiculous habit of civilized man. Tuberculosis was blamed on cigarettes, but now men of science know better. Heart disease is being blamed on smoking by some, but others know better.

We fear that science has killed more

1005150687A